



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The thought of the whole passage, lines 1136-1151, is clear and logically continuous. Hengest was meditating revenge and planning a "hostile meeting;" thus (*sww*) it was that he did not escape the fate of the world, that is death, in that Hunlafing thrust the sword into his breast. In a like manner (*swylce*), Finn himself afterwards lost his life, etc. It only remains for us to conjecture that Hengest, by his manner and conduct, provoked the Frisians to anticipate his designs by taking, themselves, the initiative.

It is, then, clearly seen that the events of the Finnsburg fragment are to be placed in the Finn episode in Beowulf between lines 1141 and 1142.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Baltimore.

A NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN GERMANY.

In 1882 Prof. Dr. H. Riegel, of Braunschweig, published a pamphlet entitled: "Ein Hauptstück von unserer Muttersprache. Mahnruf an alle national gesinnten Deutschen" (Leipzig, F. W. Grunow), in which he preached a new crusade against the foreign words infecting like a "pestilence" the body of the German language. His words were not spoken to the winds. Most of the newspapers not only applauded, but reformed; several authors joined their voices to his war-cry; Dr. Daniel Sanders published in 1884 his "Verdeutschungswörterbuch," containing all foreign words in common use together with their respective proper German substitutes; certain magistrates, clubs, and corporations labored for the good cause, and the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, following the noble example of Duke Wilhelm, of Saxe-Weimar, who from 1651-1662 presided over the so-called Fruit-bringing Society, took a step in the right direction by having the magistrates of his state directed to avoid all unnecessary foreign words in their official reports, but especially in the publication of decrees, ordinances, etc.

Encouraged by this success, Dr. Riegel conceived the plan of calling into life a society whose object and outlines of organization he laid before the public in his pamphlet, "Der allgemeine deutsche Sprachverein" (Heil-

bronn, 1885), and inspired by this document, a body of highly distinguished men, amongst others the poets H. Allmers, Fr. von Bodenstedt, R. Hamerling, and E. Scherenberg, issued an appeal to the German nation for the founding of a general society whose object should be the cultivation of the German language in general, and its purification from unnecessary foreign elements in particular. With reference to the latter, the call expressly declared that the association would use the utmost moderation and carefully avoid all exaggeration; that it recognized a certain class of indispensable foreign words, and intended to fight only those intruders, especially French, for which the German language offers satisfactory equivalents. The guiding principle should be: "No foreign word for what can be properly expressed in German."

The appeal, which invited to the formation of branch-societies throughout Germany, as well as over all foreign countries where the German idiom is spoken, met in all classes of society everywhere with a warm reception, and numerous branch organizations have since sprung up,* while others are still forming, so that there can scarcely be any doubt that this war against foreign words is an eminently popular one. Add to this, that the leaders seem to be possessed, from the tenor of their appeal, with a spirit of prudence and moderation such as will not give any occasion for ridiculing the enterprise, and there seems to be no reason why the object of the movement should not be reached, provided, however, (this point is to be emphasized) the word "*unnecessary*," used by the reformers, be taken in its restricted sense. It should embrace only those foreign words for which there really exist unobjectionable substitutes in German; as, for example, *invitieren* for *einladen*, *Soirée* for *Abendgesellschaft*, and hosts of others, which will proba-

*In the first number of the "Zeitschrift des allgemeinen deutschen Sprachvereins," edited by Dr. Riegel, which appeared on April 1, 1886, we find twenty-two organized branch-societies enumerated, to which number twelve more are added in the second number, of May 6.

We learn in the same periodical that a society under the name of "Deutscher Sprachverein" has lately been formed at Weimar under the protection of the Grand Duke, which is to extend over the entire state of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, but, we regret to say, is not to figure as a branch association, but will have an independent existence.

bly fall into well-deserved contempt. On the other hand, if the word *unnecessary* be taken in its broad signification, the success of the movement seems to me very doubtful. There is, indeed, a large class of foreign vocables which can be styled neither necessary, because there exist German substitutes for them, nor unnecessary, because these substitutes have not yet been fully sanctioned by usage. A representative of this class is the word *Sauce*, for which *Tunke* has been proposed, a most excellent German word, certainly, and yet one that nobody will receive without a smile, for the simple reason that usage has not properly extended its sphere, but has allowed the parasite *Sauce* to stifle it and occupy its rightful place, while our mental associations clustering around *Tunke* lack the dignity and nicety of its aristocratic rival. In the same way, a large number of native words capable of a many-sided development have been stunted, especially by French intruders, and I entertain no hope of seeing the writers of the day avail themselves of these starvelings until they have been nurtured into new life and strength. The proper nurseries, I think, would be the schools, and the foundation for the German language of an Imperial Academy, a suggestion that has already been urged by Prof. Riegel.

Thus, judging from the nature of things at present as well as from the experiences of the past, the new Society, placed as it is in the dilemma of going either too far or not far enough, has taken upon itself a task of extraordinary difficulty; but for this very reason its patriotic efforts excite our admiration, and enlist our sympathies and moral support.

H. C. O. HUSS.

Princeton College.

IS MACAULAY'S VOCABULARY MORE LATINIZED THAN DE QUINCEY'S?

Prof. Cook's elaborate computations of the relative proportions of native and foreign elements in the vocabularies of De Quincey and Macaulay (see MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, numbers 2 and 5) are of great interest and importance. Probably, however, most attentive readers of these authors will be surprised at

his conclusion, that De Quincey is "more Anglican than Macaulay at his best," and will find little in the facts as set forth to justify it. Professor Cook's estimates are based upon some ten thousand words from the beginning of the 'Opium Eater', and upon five thousand words from Macaulay's 'Essay on History' and an equal number from his article on 'Johnson' in the Encyclopædia Britannica. Now, any one who has given attention to the subject knows how the relative proportions of Latin and English words vary with the subject of discourse, with the audience in view, with the mood and aim of the writer, etc. Especially is this likely to be true of so vivacious, volatile, and whimsical a writer as De Quincey. Professor Cook's conclusion is, therefore, invalidated by the fact that his analysis of De Quincey's vocabulary is based upon a familiar personal narrative, while that of Macaulay's is based upon biography and criticism. Take De Quincey when he is upon good behavior, as in his 'Essay on Shakspeare' (Riverside edition, vol. vi.), and it will surely be found that the proportion of Latin words is considerably greater than in the 'Opium Eater'.

It is well known that Macaulay was always upon good behavior, even in his conversation; nevertheless, he probably does not use the same proportion of Latin words in plain narrative as in abstract exposition or argument. This consideration, again, invalidates Professor Cook's estimate of the elements of Macaulay's vocabulary at different periods of his life. The 'Essay on History' is a diffuse, critical and theoretical dissertation; the 'Life of Johnson' is a compact narrative. At any time of his life, Macaulay, or any man, would be apt to Latinize more in the former kind of composition than in the latter.

In order to make a fair comparison between the vocabularies of these or any other authors, it will be necessary to compare separately the wording in the different kinds of composition. The whole method of treatment must be carefully taken into consideration. Thus, it would hardly be fair to compare De Quincey's 'Essay on Shakspeare' with Macaulay's 'Johnson', although both were written for the Encyclopædia Britannica. For De Quincey's article is chiefly critical and argumentative, and might far more justly be compared with